

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/620,615	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TEAGUE, TOMMY KAY
	<b>Examiner</b> Tam (Jenny) Phan	<b>Art Unit</b> 2144

**All Participants:****Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_(1) Tam (Jenny) Phan. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.(2) Nathan Cass (Reg. No. 18,931). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.**Date of Interview:** 19 November 2004**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_**Type of Interview:**

- Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

18-25

Prior art documents discussed:

U.S. Patent Number 6,654,758

**Part II.****SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner initiated an interview with the applicant's attorney, Mr. Nathan Cass, to discuss a non-statutory double patenting rejection with respect to U.S. Patent Number 6,654,758 since the newly submitted claims 18-25 received on 10/20/2004 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-9 of U. S. Patent No. 6,654,758. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application (09/620,615). The attorney agreed to fax the terminal disclaimer to the Office in order to further advance prosecution.